

Remarks

The undersigned attorney and the co-inventor Yiliang Wu appreciate the courtesies extended by the Examiner during our June 19, 2006 telephone conference. This Amendment contains the substance of the interview.

Support for the added text to claims 1 and 25 and support for new claims 30–31 are found in the last sentence of paragraph [0026]. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-25 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. The Examiner indicated during the telephone conference that he is favorably inclined towards withdrawing the section 112 rejection if applicants were to amend the claims to recite that the stabilizer has “a boiling point or decomposition temperature lower than about 250 degrees C under 1 atmosphere.” Applicants have amended the claims in such a manner.

The Examiner rejected certain claims under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Griffith et al., US Patent 6,348,295 (“Griffith”). The Examiner also rejected certain claims under 35 USC 103(b) as being unpatentable over Griffith. The Examiner indicated during the telephone conference that he is favorably inclined towards withdrawing the 35 USC 102(b) rejection and the 35 USC 103(b) rejection if applicants were to amend the claims to recite that the stabilizer has “a boiling point or decomposition temperature lower than about 250 degrees C under 1 atmosphere.” Applicants have amended the claims in such a manner. Moreover, as discussed during the telephone conference, Griffith employs dodecanethiol (see column 3, lines 57-59) which has a boiling point of 266-283 degrees C under 1 atmosphere (Yiliang Wu provided this boiling point information). Thus, Griffith’s dodecanethiol is not a stabilizer encompassed by the present process due to its too high boiling point. Therefore, the present amended claims are patentable over Griffith.

Applicants disagree with the Examiner’s position that the dependent claims are unpatentable, but need not at this time specifically address the Examiner’s comments regarding these dependent claims since the independent claims are patentable over Griffith and thus the dependent claims are also patentable over Griffith. However, applicants wish to bring to the Examiner’s attention that the statement in the Office Action (page 5, second

paragraph) that Griffith teaches “moderate heating” appears to be incorrect. A fair reading of column 5, lines 30-40, of Griffith indicates that “moderate heating” refers to a drying procedure to remove carrier liquid, not to the fusing step.

In view of the foregoing, the present application as amended is in condition for allowance. In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby requested to call the undersigned attorney at (585) 423-4292, Rochester, NY.

Respectfully submitted,

/Zosan S. Soong, Reg.# 33333/

Zosan S. Soong
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 33,333
Telephone (585) 423-4292

June 20, 2006
ZSS/fsl
Xerox Corporation
Xerox Square 20A
Rochester, New York 14644